UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/973,253 | 10/09/2001 | Terry P. Mahoney | 10004444-1 | 6208 |

7590 09/26/2002

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| PAIK, STEVE S |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2876 | |

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/973,253 | MAHONEY ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Steven S. Paik | 2876 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 October 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 October 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *3* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 6-10 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sehr (USP 6,085,976).

Regarding claims 1, 6, 7 and 8, Sehr discloses an information processing method comprising:

receiving (via the card station (1) which comprises a card reader 12 and see col. 6, ll. 39-51) a data card (11 in Fig. 1) including printed indicia descriptive of user information and data information (col. 6, ll. 23-35);

reading said indicia to use said user (such as identification of service recipient) and data information to verify access credentials (col. 5, ll. 55-67 - col. 6, ll. 1-6, and col. 6, ll. 39-42)

providing access to data in response to said verification (col. 6, ll. 23-30 discloses only a rightful card holder are entitle to a service after verification process of identifying the rightful card holders).

Regarding claim 2, Sehr discloses the method as recited in rejected claim 1 stated above, where the data card is made of paper (the passenger card includes the equivalent of an electronic ticket, electronic money for payment, or security information for protecting the card content and identifying the rightful card holder. Sehr further discloses the way commercial banks clearing

electronic payments made via their paper/plastic cards. This teaching shows a data card can be made of paper or plastic. In addition, it is not extremely difficult to find a types of data card made of paper (prepaid phone cards) or in combination of paper with laminating process).

Regarding claims 9, 13 and 14, Sehr discloses a system for processing information comprising:

a processor (Fig. 1 shows a computer, which inherently comprises a processor) capable of executing the following process:

read indicia from a printed card (11) descriptive of user information (such as identification of service recipient) and data information (col. 5, ll. 55-67 - col. 6, ll. 1-6, and col. 6, ll. 39-42);

verify access credential based on said indicia (col. 5, ll. 55-67 - col. 6, ll. 1-6, and col. 6, ll. 39-42); and

provide access to data in response to said verification (col. 6, ll. 23-30 discloses only a rightful card holder are entitle to a service after verification process of identifying the rightful card holders).

Regarding claim 10, Sehr discloses the system as recited in rejected claim 9 stated above, where the data card is made of paper (the passenger card includes the equivalent of an electronic ticket, electronic money for payment, or security information for protecting the card content and identifying the rightful card holder. Sehr further discloses the way commercial banks clearing electronic payments made via their paper/plastic cards. This teaching shows a data card can be made of paper or plastic. In addition, it is not extremely difficult to find a types of data card made of paper (prepaid phone cards) or in combination of paper with laminating process).

Regarding claim 15, the system as recited in rejected claim 9 stated above, where the data comprises a print job (the passenger card 11 can therefore input, store, process, output, and display data relating to tickets, passengers, and system entities; as well as to services rendered via the card and col. 6, ll. 26-31. the aforementioned service inherently may have a print job which is an output form of data processed).

Regarding claim 16, the system as recited in rejected claim 9 stated above, where said providing access to data in response to said verification comprises decrypting said data (col. 19, ll. 12-20).

Regarding claim 17, Sehr discloses a system for processing information comprising:

a computer (Fig. 1 shows a computer 14, which inherently comprises a processor) coupled to an external peripheral device (10, 12, 13 or 15) to form a network (via communication link 16) said network being operable to:

receive (via the card station (1) which comprises a card reader 12 and see col. 6, ll. 39-51) a data card (11 in Fig. 1) including printed indicia descriptive of user information and data information (col. 6, ll. 23-35);

read said indicia to access the use information and data information for verifying access credentials (col. 5, ll. 55-67 - col. 6, ll. 1-6, and col. 6, ll. 39-42); and

provide access to data in response to said verification (col. 6, ll. 23-30 discloses only a rightful card holder are entitle to a service after verification process of identifying the rightful card holders).

Regarding claim 18, the system as recited in rejected claim 17 stated above, where said peripheral device is a printer (15).

Regarding claim 19, the system as recited in rejected claim 9 stated above, where said network (1) is further operable to decrypt said data (col. 19, ll. 12-20).

Regarding claim 20, Sehr discloses the system as recited in rejected claim 17 stated above, where the data card is made of paper (the passenger card includes the equivalent of an electronic ticket, electronic money for payment, or security information for protecting the card content and identifying the rightful card holder. Sehr further discloses the way commercial banks clearing electronic payments made via their paper/plastic cards. This teaching shows a data card can be made of paper or plastic. In addition, it is not extremely difficult to find a types of data card made of paper (prepaid phone cards) or in combination of paper with laminating process).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-5, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sehr (USP 6,085,976) in view of Colgate, Jr. (USP 5,786,587).

The teachings of Sehr have been discussed above. Re claims 3-5, 11 and 12, Sehr discloses a data card comprises a user information and data information for receiving an access to a system after a successful authentication process.

Sehr, however, fails to teach an invisible barcode having a series of user customized symbols.

Colgate, Jr. teaches a data card comprises a machine-readable holographically generated off-axis bar code invisible to the naked eye and readable by a machine reader (col. 5, ll. 30-32). The invisible barcode adds security advantage reducing the possibility of forgery.

In view of Colgate, Mr.'s teaching, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further employ an invisible barcode only visible and readable by a machine reader in addition to the data card of Sehr due to the fact that a form of machine readable data recorded on the medium for the purposes of enhancing the security advantage. Such employed technology undoubtedly increases the data card security by making it difficult for a counterfeiter to defeat the security feature of the card.

***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Urano et al. (USP 6,168,081) disclose a method and apparatus for reading invisible symbol.

Gary (USP 6,087,955) discloses a method and apparatus for controlling access to at least one program on a computer by verifying data entered through a keyboard with data stored on a token such as a card.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven S. Paik whose telephone number is 703-308-6190. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (7:00am-3:30pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-6893 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0530.

Steven S. Paik
Examiner
Art Unit 2876

ssp
September 13, 2002

MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800